

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.usplo.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/642,632	08/19/2003	Akira Tanaka	500.43031X00	3748	
20457 7590 03/16/2007 ANTONELLI, TERRY, STOUT & KRAUS, LLP 1300 NORTH SEVENTEENTH STREET			EXAMINER		
			KALAFUT, STEPHEN J		
SUITE 1800 ARLINGTON,	VA 22209-3873		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
,			1745	<u></u>	
SHORTENED STATUTOR	Y PERIOD OF RESPONSE	MAIL DATE	DELIVER'	DELIVERY MODE	
3 MO	NTHS	03/16/2007	PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

		9			
	Application No.	Applicant(s)			
	10/642,632	TANAKA, AKIRA			
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit			
	Stephen J. Kalafut	1745			
The MAILING DATE of this communication appeariod for Reply	pears on the cover sheet with the c	correspondence address			
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPL WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING D - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.1 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailin earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tir will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from e, cause the application to become ABANDONE	N. nely filed the mailing date of this communication. ED (35 U.S.C. § 133).			
Status					
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 14 D	December 2007.				
·	s action is non-final.				
3) Since this application is in condition for allowa					
closed in accordance with the practice under I	Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 4	53 O.G. 213.			
Disposition of Claims					
 4) ☐ Claim(s) 1,2 and 4-16 is/are pending in the ap 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdra 5) ☐ Claim(s) 1,2,4-13,15 and 16 is/are allowed. 6) ☐ Claim(s) 14 is/are rejected. 7) ☐ Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) ☐ Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or 	wn from consideration.				
Application Papers	·				
9) The specification is objected to by the Examine 10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) accomplicant may not request that any objection to the Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Example 11.	epted or b) objected to by the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. Settion is required if the drawing(s) is ob	e 37 CFR 1.85(a). jected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).			
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119					
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority document 2. Certified copies of the priority document 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority application from the International Bureat * See the attached detailed Office action for a list	is have been received. Is have been received in Application rity documents have been received u (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	ion No ed in this National Stage			
Attachment(s)					
Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) Interview Summary				
Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date	Paper No(s)/Mail Date of Informal Paper No(s) Date of Informal Paper No(s) Date of Informal Paper No(s)				

Claim 14 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. This claim is unclear as to whether the phrase "connected to each other through the membrane electrode assembly" requires direct contact between the two contact members, or only indirect contact, with the MEA being located between the two. The former interpretation would be confusing because it would contradict the phrase "prevented from contacting each other". The phrase "through the membrane electrode assembly" appears to modify both "are prevented from contacting" and "connected to each other", thus implying that opposite conditions are true within the same area.

Claim 14 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Dristy *et al.* (US 6,926,988), for reasons of record.

Claims 1, 2, 4-13, 15 and 16, for reasons of record, are allowed.

Applicant's arguments filed 14 December 2006 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicant argues that the two contact members of Dristy *et al*. "do not appear to be connected to each other, as set forth in independent claim 14". This is not persuasive because the claim is unclear as to whether the two contact members are required to be in direct contact through the MEA, or may merely be in indirect contact, where each is deposed on a side of the MEA. This is shown in present figure 1, where the contacts are mutually separated by the MEA,

Application/Control Number: 10/642,632 Page 3

Art Unit: 1745

but are in direct contact only <u>outside</u> of the MEA, and thus not through it. Likewise, the two contacts of (56, 60) Dristy *et al.* are disposed on opposite sides of their MEA, and would be in indirect connection through that MEA. Moving the phrase "through the membrane electrode assembly in the pressing direction" to a position between "prevented from contacting each other" and "connected to each other" is suggested. Thus, the contacts are prevented from directly contacting each other through the MEA, but are connected to each other within the head surface area of the pressing member.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Stephen J. Kalafut whose telephone number is 571-272-1286. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Fri 8:00 am-4:30 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Patrick J. Ryan can be reached on 571-272-1292. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

STEPHEN KALAFUT
PRIMARY EXAMINER
GROUP 1700